

This record is a partial extract of the original cable. The full text of the original cable is not available.

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 02 THE HAGUE 002994

SIPDIS

STATE FOR AC/CB, NP/CBM, VC/CCB, L/ACV, IO/S  
SECDEF FOR OSD/ISP  
JOINT STAFF FOR DD PMA-A FOR WTC  
COMMERCE FOR BIS (GOLDMAN)  
NSC FOR CHUPA  
WINPAC FOR LIEPMAN

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: PARM PREL CWC

SUBJECT: CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION (CWC): WEEKLY WRAP-UP  
FOR 28 NOV 2003

This is CWC-131 -03.

-----  
Protection Workshop  
-----

11. (U) This November 19-20 workshop provided a valuable exchange of ideas and information. Mainly structured to put experts in the area of CW assistance and protection in touch with various companies who provide equipment, it also gave experts (and local delegations) the chance to hear how a number of States Parties view assistance and protection as well as what measures States Parties are taking in terms of emergency planning.

12. (U) South Africa, Czech Republic, The Netherlands, Sweden, UK, Japan, Switzerland, Australia and even NATO all gave presentations on the various steps they are taking to prepare for a possible chemical attack. The common theme in all presentations was that first response is a local responsibility. By the time the national level is called in it is often too late. The focus instead was how best the national government can assist the local level in preparing for such an incident. In addition, an American from the Colorado Emergency Planning Commission gave a presentation on the public role in preparing and responding to a chemical incident. This presentation was very well received by participants.

13. (U) A number of U.S. companies were also present at the exhibition. Del officer spoke at length with representatives from both Batelle and Constellation Technology Corporation who were very eager to talk to a member of the U.S. Delegation. Both primarily wanted to hear about the role the U.S. delegation plays at the OPCW.

14. (U) Wednesday evening deloffs participated in a no-host dinner with three Amcits invited to participate in the course by the TS: Tim Gablehouse, Colorado Emergency Planning Commission; Melanie Granberg, Attorney with Colorado law firm of Gablehouse, Calkins and Granberg, LLC; and Michael Penders, President of Environmental Security International- a private DC based consulting firm (former Chairman of the G8 Nations Project on International Environment Crime and Eco-Terrorism). The evening provided a useful exchange of ideas and views related to the CWC. Specifically they were interested in learning more about the Organization as a whole, issues related to commercial/industrial security and the transfer of chemicals, as well as issues related to informing the public of their safety from possible CW related incidents both at industrial commercial sites and military sites.

-----  
Article X Consultations  
-----

15. (U) While the consultations on 21 November were convened to discuss the proposal for a new format for States Parties to make declarations on provisions of assistance (Article X, para 7(c)), most time was actually spent looking at ICA/APB's plan of events for 2004. When discussion did turn to the new format, the facilitator (Hans Schramml - Austria) explained that his reason for proposing such a format was to make offers of assistance easier for the Technical Secretariat to process and provide structure to the offers. Currently the TS has many incomplete and/or vague offers of assistance from

SIPDIS

a very small number of SPs and the hope is that this format will help provide cohesion among the offers. Del stated that this would be best if it were a voluntary format as opposed to a requirement for a SP to offer assistance. Del offered that many SP's have different constraints and processes for making offers of assistance and requiring SPs to use such a form may be difficult. There were a couple of calls by SPs (Iran, UK) that a plan of action on Article X may be worth exploring.

-----  
Article X Consultation  
-----

----- Discussion with the UK in advance of consultations on Declaration Format for National Protective Programs -----

16. (U) The UK (Gabby Krueger and Clive Rowland) were very appreciative of U.S. comments on their proposed format. They took all our comments on board and look forward to discussing the format in more detail in the future. In response to U.S. concerns on items 4 and 7 (efforts at the local and regional level) they explained that the goal here was to capture the differences in the way SPs structure their efforts. Many SPs have a regional or local mechanism to respond to CW incidents that are supported by, but not run by their national government. The UK believes rewording may help solve the U.S. problem with this item (though no alternate wording was proposed). In regard to the U.S. concern on items 6 and 23 (references to publicly available information) the UK understands our concern and again believes the items can be reworded. They did not intend for these two items to be all-inclusive of every possible publicly available bit of information, but rather as a jumping point or reference point for SPs to gather more information. On our last point regarding R&D facilities, the UK is looking at possibilities. The U.S. is not the only country to voice concerns over providing this information.

----- Article X Consultation -----

17. (U) The consultation on 24 November focused on the UK proposed format for Declaration of National Protective Programs. Most SPs did not have comments back yet from capital. Krueger went through the document paragraph by paragraph in order to pass along comments from the Protection Network to delegations. Beyond these comments (see below) SPs grabbed onto our statement that "it is important that our efforts strike a balance between the desire for transparency and concerns related to the sensitivity and practical difficulties in gathering and releasing selected information. India, Iran, The Netherlands, Japan, France, China all echoed this sentiment. South Africa was very vocal and laid down a marker regarding the length and detail of information in the proposed format. On a number of different occasions during the consultations the delegate from South Africa made it very clear that Pretoria believes that information outside of national programs was not relevant and should not be the bulk of the declaration (they believe it currently is the bulk of the declaration). They do not see the value added in having questions outside of national protective programs and believe the format should be much shorter. Krueger's plan is to have a revised draft ready for circulation in mid-January and follow up with another round of consultations the end of January.

18. (U) Proposed Changes by the Protection Network:

-- Question 3: include at end of last sentence after terrorists "all other non-State actors".

-- Question 5: add sub item (e) - Would X SP like to receive assistance/expert advice?

-- Question 6: Suggest opening to broader than just governmental.

-- Question 7: Suggest breaking into "implementing" and "developing" - for example Implementing (a), (b), (c), Developing (a), (b), (c).

-- Question 8: Subitem (a) delete "designs that were". Include in (a) and (c) - commercial.

-- Question 9: Add "Hazard modeling". In "Decontamination measure for personnel or equipment" change "measure" to "technologies".

19. (U) Javits sends.  
SOBEL